UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,168	01/17/2002	Jeffrey G. Anderson	270/224	5858

22249   7590   12/07/2004

LYON & LYON LLP
633 WEST FIFTH STREET
SUITE 4700
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071

EXAMINER
WU, YICUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/054,168	ANDERSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yicun Wu	2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 January 2002_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _17 January 2002_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _1-17-2002_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

III. DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-36 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which

forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
> disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at
> the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the
> art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 4-5, 7-31 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Mousseau et al. (U.S. Patent

6,779,019) in view of Ims et al. (U.S. Patent 6,505,200) further

in view of Subrahmanyam (U.S. Patent 6,735,601).

As to Claim 1, Mousseau et al. discloses a system for

remote file access comprising:

a server including a communication module (see Fig. 1) and

a host computer communicatively coupled to the server (i.e. host

system)(Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45),

the host computer including a storage device for holding a

plurality of files (i.e. user data items) (Fig. 1 and col. 9,

lines 26-45);

a remote client communicatively coupled to the server

and configured to initiate a task request to retrieve at

least one of the plurality of files (i.e. Message C in FIG. 1

represents an external message from a sender that is not

directly connected to LAN 14, such as the user's mobile data

communication device) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45); and

a local agent (i.e. redirector program) (Fig. 1 and col. 9,

lines 26-45) communicatively coupled to the host computer (i.e.

host system)(col. 9, lines 29-30) and the server (i.e. network

server)(col. 5, lines 1-20), the local agent configured (i.e.

The preferred method of detecting new messages is using

Microsoft's.RTM. Messaging API (MAPI) (col. 11, lines 25-35) and

receive the task request, instruct the host computer to execute

the task request, and return the at least one file (i.e. data

items)(col. 10, lines 42-45) to the server (i.e. user selected

data items can be replicated from the host to the mobile device

and vice versa.) (col. 10, lines 42-45).

Mousseau et al. does not teach task queue.

Ims et al. teaches task queue (i.e. queue. Col. 5, lines

26-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

have modified Mousseau et al. with task queue.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Mousseau et al. by the teaching of Ims et al. because providing task queue allows more efficient, less complex update access to a back-end data store as taught by Ims et al. (col. 4, lines 46-50).

Mousseau et al. as modified does not teach to poll the server.

Subrahmanyam teaches to poll the server (i.e. by polling the provider system)(col. 24, lines 6-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Mousseau et al. with to poll the server.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Mousseau et al. by the teaching of Subrahmanyam because providing to poll the server allows the broker system to substantially seamlessly handle such disconnects as taught by Subrahmanyam (col. 24, lines 42-48).

As to claim 4, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a system wherein the local agent is installed on the host computer (i.e.

the redirector software 12 is operating at the server 11)(col.

13, lines 8-20).

As to claim 5, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> as modified teaches a system

wherein the local agent is installed on a computer

communicatively coupled to the host computer through a local

area network. (FIG. 1 and col. 11, lines 20-28).

As to Claim 7, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> discloses a network

communication protocol for remote access to computer readable

files, comprising:

receiving a task request at a server from a remote client

(Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45), the task request identifying a

file (i.e. message) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45);

receiving a poll at the server from a local agent (

<u>Subrahmanyam</u> col. 24, lines 6-10), the poll checking for

task requests received at the server (

<u>Subrahmanyam</u> col. 24, lines 6-10);

sending the task request from the server to the local agent

(i.e. redirector program) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45);

receiving the file at the server (i.e. host system)(col.

9, lines 29-30) from the local agent (i.e. redirector program);

and

transferring the file from the server to the remote

client (i.e. user selected data items can be replicated

from the host to the mobile device and vice versa.) (col. 10,

lines 42-45).

As to claim 8, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a remote

file access protocol further comprising:

creating a notification at the server for the remote client

(i.e. A new mail notification is received)(Mousseau et al. col.

23, lines 25-34);

receiving an instruction at the server concerning transfer

of the file from the server (i.e. user selected data items can

be replicated from the host to the mobile device and vice

versa.) (Mousseau et al. col. 10, lines 42-45); and

wherein the act of transferring the file is performed

in accordance with the instruction (i.e. user selected data

items can be replicated from the host to the mobile device and

vice versa.) (Mousseau et al. Col. 10, lines 42-45).

As to claim 9, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a remote

file access protocol further comprising:

wherein the act of receiving the task request (i.e.

redirect certain message attachments) (Mousseau et al. col. 10,

lines 2-6) includes receiving the task request through a speech

module (i.e. audio files, such as a voice mail system) (Mousseau

et al. col. 10, lines 2-6).

As to claim 10, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a

remote file access protocol further comprising:

wherein the act of transferring the file to the remote

client (i.e. redirect certain message attachments) (Mousseau et

al. col. 10, lines 2-6) includes transferring the file through

the speech module (i.e. audio files, such as a voice mail

system) (Mousseau et al. col. 10, lines 2-6).

As to claim 11, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a

remote file access protocol further comprising:

wherein the act of transferring the file to the remote

client involves transferring the file through the speech module

(i.e. audio files, such as a voice mail system) (Mousseau et al.

col. 10, lines 2-6) to a second remote client (Mousseau et al.

Fig. 1), which is other than the remote client that initiated

the task request (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1 and Col. 24, lines 5-

45), the second remote client identified in the instruction

concerning the transfer of the file (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1 and

Col. 24, lines 5-45).

As to claim 12, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> as modified teaches a remote file access protocol further comprising:

wherein the act of transferring the file to the remote client includes transferring the file through a speech module (i.e. audio files, such as a voice mail system) (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> col. 10, lines 2-6), disposed between the server and the remote client (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> Fig. 1).

As to claim 13, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> as modified teaches a remote file access protocol further comprising:

wherein the act of transferring the file to the remote client includes transferring the file to a second remote client (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> Fig. 1), which is other than the remote client that initiated the task request (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> Fig. 1 and Col. 24, lines 5-45), the second remote client identified in the instruction concerning the transfer of the file (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> Fig. 1 and Col. 24, lines 5-45).

As to claim 14, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> as modified teaches a remote file access protocol further comprising:

sending the task request from the remote client to the server (i.e. Message C in FIG. 1 represents an external message

from a sender that is not directly connected to LAN 14, such as

the user's mobile data communication device) (Fig. 1 and col. 9,

lines 26-45);

receiving the notification indicating that the task request

is complete at the remote client from the server (i.e. user

selected data items can be replicated from the host to the

mobile device and vice versa.) (Mousseau et al. col. 10, lines

42-45);

sending the instruction concerning the transfer of the file

from the remote client to the server (i.e. Message C in FIG. 1

represents an external message from a sender that is not

directly connected to LAN 14, such as the user's mobile data

communication device) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45); and

receiving the file at the remote client from the server in

accordance with the instruction (i.e. user selected data items

can be replicated from the host to the mobile device and vice

versa.) (Mousseau et al. col. 10, lines 42-45).

As to claim 15, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a

remote file access protocol further comprising:

sending the poll from the local agent (Subrahmanyam col.

24, lines 6-10) to the server at a periodic interval (i.e. by

polling the provider system)(Subrahmanyam col. 24, lines 6-10);

receiving the task request at the local agent from the
server in reply to the poll (i.e. by polling the provider
system) (Subrahmanyam col. 24, lines 6-10);

completing a task (i.e. user selected data items can be
replicated from the host to the mobile device and vice versa.)
(Mousseau et al. col. 10, lines 42-45) corresponding to the task
request by the local agent (i.e. redirector program) (Mousseau
et al. Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45); and

sending the file from the local agent to the server, as
a consequence of completing the task (i.e. user selected data
items can be replicated from the host to the mobile device and
vice versa.) (Mousseau et al. col. 10, lines 42-45).

As to claim 16, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a
remote file access protocol further comprising:

sending a request for the file (i.e. user data items) (Fig.
1 and col. 9, lines 26-45) from the local agent to
a local computer (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45); and

receiving the file (i.e. user data items) (Fig. 1 and col.
9, lines 26-45) at the local agent from the local computer (Fig.
1 and col. 9, lines 26-45).

As to claim 17, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> as modified teaches a
remote file access protocol further comprising:

receiving the réquest for the file (i.e. user data items)
(Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45) at the local computer from the
local agent (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45); and

returning the file from the local computer to the local
agent (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45).

As to Claim 18, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> discloses computer readable
medium including sequences of instructions for causing one or
more processors to perform acts for implementing a network
communication protocol for remote access to computer readable
files, the acts comprising:

receiving a task request at a server from a remote client
(Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45), the task request identifying a
file (i.e. message) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45);

receiving a poll at the server from a local agent
(<u>Subrahmanyam</u> col. 24, lines 6-10), checking for task requests
received at the server (i.e. The preferred method of detecting
new messages is using Microsoft's. RTM. Messaging API (MAPI)
(col. 11, lines 25-35);

sending the task request from the server to the local agent
(i.e. redirector program) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45);

receiving the file at the server (i.e. host system)(col. 9, lines 29-30) from the local agent (i.e. redirector program); and

transferring the file from the server to the remote client (i.e. user selected data items can be replicated from the host to the mobile device and vice versa.) (col. 10, lines 42-45).

As to Claim 19, Mousseau et al. discloses computer readable medium comprising:

creating a notification at the server for the remote client (i.e. A new mail notification is received)(Mousseau et al. col. 23, lines 25-34);

receiving an instruction at the server concerning transfer of the file from the server (i.e. user selected data items can be replicated from the host to the mobile device and vice versa.) (Mousseau et al. col. 10, lines 42-45); and

wherein the act of transferring the file is performed in accordance with the instruction (i.e. user selected data items can be replicated from the host to the mobile device and vice versa.) (Mousseau et al. Col. 10, lines 42-45).

As to Claim 20, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> discloses computer readable

medium comprising:

wherein the act of receiving the task request (i.e.

redirect certain message attachments) (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> col. 10,

lines 2-6) includes receiving the task request through a speech

module (i.e. audio files, such as a voice mail system) (<u>Mousseau</u>

<u>et al.</u> col. 10, lines 2-6).

As to Claim 21, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> discloses computer readable

medium comprising:

wherein the act of transferring the file to the remote

client (i.e. redirect certain message attachments) (<u>Mousseau et</u>

<u>al.</u> col. 10, lines 2-6) includes transferring the file through

the speech module (i.e. audio files, such as a voice mail

system) (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> col. 10, lines 2-6).

As to Claim 22, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> discloses computer readable

medium comprising:

wherein the act of transferring the file to the remote

client involves transferring the file through the speech module

(i.e. audio files, such as a voice mail system) (<u>Mousseau et al.</u>

col. 10, lines 2-6) to a second remote client (<u>Mousseau et al.</u>

Fig. 1), which is other than the remote client that initiated

the task request (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1 and Col. 24, lines 5-45), the second remote client identified in the instruction concerning the transfer of the file (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1 and Col. 24, lines 5-45).

As to Claim 23, Mousseau et al. discloses computer readable medium comprising:

wherein the act of transferring the file to the remote client ((Mousseau et al. Fig. 1 and Col. 24, lines 5-45) includes transferring the file through a speech module (i.e. audio files, such as a voice mail system) (Mousseau et al. col. 10, lines 2-6).

As to Claim 24, Mousseau et al. discloses computer readable medium:

wherein the act of transferring the file to the remote client includes transferring the file to a second remote client (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1), which is other than the remote client that initiated the task request (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1 and Col. 24, lines 5-45), the second remote client identified in the instruction concerning the transfer of the file (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1 and Col. 24, lines 5-45).

As to Claim 25, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> discloses computer readable medium comprising:

sending the task request from the remote client to the server (i.e. Message C in FIG. 1 represents an external message from a sender that is not directly connected to LAN 14, such as the user's mobile data communication device) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45);

receiving the notification indicating that the task request is complete at the remote client from the server (i.e. user selected data items can be replicated from the host to the mobile device and vice versa.) (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> col. 10, lines 42-45);

sending the instruction concerning the transfer of the file from the remote client to the server (i.e. Message C in FIG. 1 represents an external message from a sender that is not directly connected to LAN 14, such as the user's mobile data communication device) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45); and

receiving the file at the remote client from the server in accordance with the instruction (i.e. user selected data items can be replicated from the host to the mobile device and vice versa.) (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> col. 10, lines 42-45).

As to Claim 26, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> discloses computer readable medium comprising:

sending the poll from the local agent (i.e. redirector program) (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45) to the server at a periodic interval (i.e. by polling the provider system) (<u>Subrahmanyam</u> col. 24, lines 6-10);

receiving the task request at the local agent from the server in reply to the poll (i.e. by polling the provider system) (<u>Subrahmanyam</u> col. 24, lines 6-10);

completing a task (i.e. user selected data items can be replicated from the host to the mobile device and vice versa.) (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> col. 10, lines 42-45) corresponding to the task request by the local agent (i.e. redirector program) (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45); and

sending the file from the local agent to the server, as a consequence of completing the task (i.e. user selected data items can be replicated from the host to the mobile device and vice versa.) (<u>Mousseau et al.</u> col. 10, lines 42-45).

As to Claim 27, <u>Mousseau et al.</u> discloses computer readable medium comprising:

sending a request for the file (i.e. user data items) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45) from the local agent to

a local computer (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45); and

receiving the file (i.e. user data items) (Fig. 1 and col.

9, lines 26-45) at the local agent from the local computer (Fig.

1 and col. 9, lines 26-45).

As to Claim 28, Mousseau et al. discloses computer readable

medium comprising:

receiving the request for the file (i.e. user data items)

(Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45) at the local computer from the

local agent (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45); and

returning the file from the local computer to the local agent

(Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45).

As to Claim 29, Mousseau et al. discloses a computer

readable medium including sequences of instructions for causing

one or more processors to perform acts for remote file access,

the sequences of instructions including a server module, and a

local agent module (see Fig. 1), wherein:

the server module is configured to receive a task (i.e.

message)(Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45) a request from a remote

client and store the task request in a task queue(Ims et al.

Col. 5, lines 26-45), the task request identifying a file in a

host computer (i.e. host system) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-

45); and

the local agent module (i.e. redirector program) (Fig. 1

and col. 9, lines 26-45) is configured to poll (Subrahmanyam

col. 24, lines 6-10) the server module to receive the task

request from the task queue (Ims et al. Col. 5, lines 26-45),

and

instruct the host computer to execute the task request

(i.e. user selected data items can be replicated from the host

to the mobile device and vice versa.) (col. 10, lines 42-45).

As to claim 30, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a

computer readable medium wherein

the local agent module (i.e. redirector program) (Fig. 1

and col. 9, lines 26-45) is further configured to cause the file

(i.e. user data items) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45) to be

uploaded to the server module (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1); and

the server module is further configured to cause the file

(i.e. user data items) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45) to be

forwarded to a remote client (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1 and Col.

24, lines 5-45) other than the remote client that sent the task

request (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1 and Col. 24, lines 5-45).

As to claim 31, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a
computer readable medium wherein

the local agent module (i.e. redirector program) (Fig. 1
and col. 9, lines 26-45) is further configured to cause the file
(i.e. user data items) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45) to be
uploaded to the server module (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1); and

the server module is further configured to cause the file
(i.e. user data items) (Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 26-45) to be
forwarded to a remote client (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1 and Col.
24, lines 5-45) other than the remote client that sent the task
request (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1 and Col. 24, lines 5-45).

As to claim 34, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a
computer readable medium wherein the local agent is installed on
the host computer (i.e. the redirector software 12 is operating
at the server 11)(col. 13, lines 8-20).

As to claim 35, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a
computer readable medium wherein the local agent is installed on
a computer communicatively coupled to the host computer through
a local area network. (FIG. 1 and col. 11, lines 20-28).

4.   Claims 2-3, 6, 32-33 and 36, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Mousseau et al. (U.S. Patent

6,779,019) in view of Ims et al. (U.S. Patent 6,505,200) further

in view of Subrahmanyam (U.S. Patent 6,735,601) further in view

of Hanhan (U.S. Patent 6,711,611).

As to Claims 2 and 32 Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a

system wherein a speech module (i.e. audio files, such as a

voice mail system)(Mousseau et al. col. 10, lines 2-6), disposed

between the server and the remote client (Mousseau et al. Fig.

1).

Mousseau et al. as modified does not teach the speech

module configured to translate text from the at least one file

from the server into speech directed to the remote client.

Hanhan teaches the speech module configured to translate

text (i.e. speech to text converter) from the at least one file

from the server into speech directed to the remote client (Fig.

1 and col. 8, lines 1-32)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

have modified Mousseau et al. with the speech module configured

to translate text from the at least one file from the server

into speech directed to the remote client.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Mousseau et al. as modified by the teaching of Hanhan because providing the speech module configured to translate text from the at least one file from the server into speech directed to the remote client allows full and unfettered access to home-center data and services for a mobile knowledge worker associated with the home center as taught by Hanhan (col. 5 lines 20-29).

As to claims 3 and 33, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a system wherein speech module is configured to return the translated text (i.e. speech to text converter) from the at least one file to a remote client other than the remote client that initiated the task request (Hanhan Fig. 1 and col. 8, lines 1-32).

As to claims 6 and 36, Mousseau et al. as modified teaches a system wherein the server further includes

system (Mousseau et al. Fig. 1) configured to hold remote client information, local agent information, and information relating users of the system (i.e. determining the type of mobile data communication device and its address, for programming a preferred list of message types or folder names

that are to be redirected, and for determining whether the

mobile device can receive and process certain types of message

attachments) (Mousseau et al. col. 4, lines 13-25 and Fig. 1)

Mousseau et al. does not teach a relational database

management system.

Hanhan teaches a relational database management system

(Fig. 1 and col. 12, lines 7-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

have modified Mousseau et al. with a relational database

management system.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

modified Mousseau et al. as modified by the teaching of Hanhan

because providing a relational database management system allows

full and unfettered access to home-center data and services for a

mobile knowledge worker associated with the home center as

taught by Hanhan (col. 5 lines 20-29).

Other Prior Art Made of Record

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is

considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. U.S. patents

and U.S. patent application publications will not be supplied

with Office actions.   Examiners advises the Applicant that the

<u>cited</u> U.S. patents and patent application publications are

available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate

source, <u>all</u> U.S. patents and patent application publications are

available on the USPTO web site (<u>www.uspto.gov</u>

<u><http://www.uspto.gov/></u>), from the Office of Public Records and

from commercial sources. For the use of the Office's PAIR

system, Applicants may refer to the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at <u><http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html></u> or 1-866-217-

9197.

Multer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,696,);

Lazaridis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,312);

Meadway et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,205);

Reisman (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,464); and

Kloba et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,316).

Conclusion

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier
communications from the examiner should be directed to Yicun Wu
whose telephone number is 703-305-4889. The examiner can
normally be reached on 8:00 am to 4:30 pm, Monday -Friday.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful,
the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-
305-3830. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this
application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for
regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final
communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status
of this application or proceeding should be directed to the
receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Yicun Wu
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

November 22, 2004

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ATTY. DOCKET D.	SERIAL NO.
270/224	10/054,168

APPLICANT: Jeffrey G. Anderson, et al.	**RECEIVED**
FILING DATE: January 17, 2002	GROUP: 2175 MAR 1 4 2002

Technology Center 2100

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIALS		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUB CLASS	FILING DATE
ᵧᴹ	AA	6,108,711	08/22/00	Beck et al.	709	242	09/11/98
ᵧᴹ	AB	6,304,881 B1	10/16/01	Halim et al.	707	201	03/03/98
ᵧᴹ	AC	US2001/0023448 A1 *671161*	09/20/01	Hanhan	709	231 218	09/24/99
ᵧᴹ	AD	6,151,606	11/21/00	Mendez	707	201	01/16/98
ᵧᴹ	AE	6,023,708	02/08/00	Mendez et al.	707	203	05/29/97
ᵧᴹ	AF	6,131,096	10/10/00	Ng et al.	707	10	10/05/98
ᵧᴹ	AG	6,233,341 B1	05/15/01	Riggins	380	277	05/19/98
ᵧᴹ	AH	6,131,116	10/10/00	Riggins et al.	709	219	12/13/96

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUB CLASS	TRANSLATION YES	NO
ᵧᴹ	AI	WO 01/715399 A2	09/27/01	WO	G06F	17/00	Y	
ᵧᴹ	AJ	WO 01/59998 A2	08/16/01	WO	H04L	12/58	Y	
ᵧᴹ	AK	WO 01/135772 A1	02/22/01	WO	H04L	9/08	Y	
ᵧᴹ	AL	WO 00/11832 A1	03/02/00	WO	H04L	9/00	Y	
ᵧᴹ	AM	WO 00/11567 A1	03/02/00	WO	G06F	17/00	Y	
ᵧᴹ	AN	WO 99/06900 A2	02/11/99	WO	G06F		Y	
ᵧᴹ	AO	WO 99/05813 A2	02/04/99	WO	H04K	1/00	Y	
ᵧᴹ	AP	WO 99/05620 A1	02/04/99	WO	G06F	17/30	Y	
ᵧᴹ	AQ	WO 98/49625 A1	11/05/98	WO	G06F	13/00	Y	

OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, etc.)

ᵧᴹ	AR	2001 Experticity, Inc., *GoToMyPC: A Secure Remote-Access Solution*, (visited Jan. 25, 2002) <http://www.gotomypc.com>.

EXAMINER: To Be Determined	DATE CONSIDERED: 7/30/04

EXAMINER: Please initial if reference is considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include a copy of this form with next communication to applicant. Thank you.

	ATTY. DOCKET NO. 270/224	SERIAL NO. 10/054,168
	APPLICANT: Jeffrey G. Anderson, et al.	
	FILING DATE: January 17, 2002	GROUP: 2161

MAY 3 0 2002

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUB CLASS	FILING DATE
(initial)	AA	6,240,296 B1	05/29/01	Yu, et al.	455	466	03/10/98
(initial)	AB	6,208,870 B1	03/27/01	Lorello, et al.	455	466	06/01/99
(initial)	AC	6,148,197	11/14/00	Bridges, et al.	455	432.3	03/06/98
(initial)	AD	6,141,550	10/31/00	Ayabe, et al.	455	433	01/08/99
(initial)	AE	6,134,432	10/17/00	Holmes, et al.	455	412.1	06/17/98
(initial)	AF	6,104,924	08/15/00	Shirai	455	418	07/15/96
(initial)	AG	5,966,652	10/12/99	Coad, et al.	455	412.1	08/29/96
(initial)	AH	5,951,640	09/14/99	Laura	709	217	02/19/97
(initial)	AI	5,946,630	08/31/99	Willars, et al.	455	466	07/10/96

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUB CLASS	TRANSLATION YES	NO

RECEIVED
JUN 04 2002
Technology Center 2100

OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, etc.)

EXAMINER: To Be Determined (signature)	DATE CONSIDERED: 7/20/04

EXAMINER: Please initial if reference is considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include a copy of this form with next communication to applicant. Thank you.

Information Disclosure Statement – Section 9 PTO-1449   Page 1 of 1

SD-172390.1

		Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination
Notice of References Cited		10/054,168	ANDERSON ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Yicun Wu	2175	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-6,735,601	05-2004	Subrahmanyam, Pratap	707/200
	B	US-6,779,019	08-2004	Mousseau et al.	709/206
	C	US-6,757,696	06-2004	Multer et al.	707/201
	D	US-6,658,464	12-2003	Reisman, Richard R.	709/219
	E	US-6,341,316	01-2002	Kloba et al.	709/248
	F	US-6,675,205	01-2004	Meadway et al.	709/219
	G	US-6,505,200	01-2003	Ims et al.	707/8
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.